



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,565	03/27/2006	Kazuyuki Yamane	2006-0354A	7141

513 7590 04/14/2010  
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.  
1030 15th Street, N.W.,  
Suite 400 East  
Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER
----------

ROBITAILLE, JOHN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1791

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/14/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com  
coa@wenderoth.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/573,565	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YAMANE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> John P. Robitaille	<b>Art Unit</b> 1791	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7, & 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,853,639 (Kawakami et al., '639 hereafter) in view of U.S. Patent 6,245,437 (Shiiki et al., '437 hereafter) in view of attached Nonpatent Literature entitled "polymers.htm".

3. Regarding claim 1, '639 teaches a process for producing a transparent multilayer stretched product, comprising: providing a resin including at least one layer of polyglycolic acid (PGA) resin, heat-forming and cooling the resin, reheating the laminate until the polyglycolic acid resin layer is crystallized, and then stretching the re-heated resin laminate (C4L15-C4L25). '639 does not teach that the PGA is crystallized to opacity or that the PGA is part of a laminate.

4. Regarding the opacity of the PGA layer during the intermediate step, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to crystallize the PGA layer to opacity, since it has been held that a discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in

Art Unit: 1791

the art. One would have been motivated to crystallize the PGA to full opacity for the purpose of ensuring crystallization of the PGA layer in order to impart gas barrier properties to the PGA layer. '639 teaches crystallization, without specifically stating % crystallization, in order to promote the barrier properties of the film. (See: In re Antonie 195 USPQ 233)

5. In the same field of endeavor, film production, '437 teaches the incorporation of a layer of PGA into a laminate sheet for the benefit of producing a film with the desired heat resistance and gas barrier properties. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of '639 with '437 for the benefit of producing a transparent film with heat resistance and transparency (ABSTRACT).

6. Regarding the intermediate haze, the previous art combination does not teach the haze of the laminate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to ensure that the haze of the laminate was at least 40% prior to stretching, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. Because it was known at the time of invention that degree of haze is correlated to degree of crystallization (as taught by the attached non-patent literature entitled "polymer.htm"), one would have been motivated to ensure that the haze was at least 40% in order to ensure that the PGA was sufficiently crystallized.

7. Regarding the final haze of the laminate film, '639 teaches that the final film is clear (C8L26).

8. Regarding claim 2, '639 teaches that the resin laminate is transparent (C8L25).

Art Unit: 1791

9. Regarding claim 3, the previous art combination does not teach that the PGA is at most 10 wt.% of the laminate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use 10 wt. % or less PGA, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. One would have been motivated to use at most 10 wt. % of PGA for the benefit of providing a film laminate with sufficient gas barrier properties and biodegradability, as taught by '437 (C2L5-C2L15).

10. Regarding claim 3, '639 teaches the PGA content of the film should be about 20 %wt. (C11L60-C11L65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to reduce the amount of PGA 10 wt. % or less PGA, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. One would have been motivated to use at most 10 wt. % of PGA for the benefit of increasing the durability of the film ('437: C2L5-C2L15).

11. Regarding claim 4, '639 teaches a process wherein the polyglycolic acid resin layer comprises a polyglycolic acid resin having a sufficiently high content of polymerized glycolic acid units as to exhibit a gas-barrier property (Table 2.).

12. Regarding claim 5, '639 teaches that the PGA comprises glycolic acid homopolymer (C3L54).

13. Regarding claim 7, '639 does not teach an aromatic polyester resin layer.

14. In the same field of endeavor, resin films, '437 teaches the use of polyester terephthalate for the benefit of providing a base layer for the PGA layer to rest on. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

Art Unit: 1791

to combine the teachings of '639 and '437 for the benefit of providing a gas impermeable, shrink resistant film.

15. Regarding claim 8, '639 does not teach an additional biodegradable layer.

16. In the same field of endeavor,, films, '437 teaches the use of additional biodegradable layers (C3L65) for the benefit of minimizing the environmental burden of the resin laminate. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of '639 and '437 for the benefit of minimizing the environmental burden of the resin laminate.

### ***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant has put forward several arguments in support of the instant application.

The are:

- a. Kawakami et al. do not teach the effect of crystallization prior to stretching PGA resin.
- b. Kawakami et al.'s quenching step is to retain the PGA resin in an amorphous state.
- c. There are unexpected results.
- d. The applied prior art does not teach crystallization, while the claim requires it.

18. Regarding the first three arguments, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Art Unit: 1791

19. Regarding the third argument, the specification requires more steps than those claimed to achieve the unexpected result of more smoothly stretching the laminate film. Applicant is reminded that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., smooth stretching) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

20. Further regarding the third argument, since the cited prior art combination teaches the steps claimed, including stretching and orientation, it is unclear how 'smoothly stretching' differs from the prior art since the alleged unexpected result is described only with a qualitative term of degree.

21. Regarding the fourth argument, both '639 and '437 teach the crystallization of the film.

### ***Conclusion***

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1791

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Robitaille whose telephone number is (571) 270-7006. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joe Del Sole can be reached on (571) 272-1130. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JPR

/Joseph S. Del Sole/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791